

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending. In the present amendment, Claims 1-4 are currently amended, and no claims are added or canceled herewith. Support for the present amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 5, lines 1-8, and in original Claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Desyatov (Russian Patent No. 2057647); Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,347,287, hereinafter “Lewis”); Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Desyatov in view of Desyatov ‘604 (Russian Patent No. 2052604); and Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lewis in view of Strachan (Great Britain Patent No. 2259044).

This amendment is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 which, after final rejection, permits entering of amendments canceling claims, complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action, or presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. The present amendment amends Claims 1-4 to include only subject matter which was earlier presented. Thus, no new matter has been added, and this amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 2-4 are hereby amended as suggested in the Office Action. In view of amended Claims 2-4, it is believed that all pending claims are definite and no further rejections on that basis are anticipated. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part, “after impregnation of the blank with a binder along a full surface of the blank to obtain a prepreg, hardening the binder during hot-pressing, wherein a heat supply for hardening the binder in the prepreg is applied within boundaries of prepreg parts, and conditions slowing down the hardening along the prepreg between said parts are created to obtain a plane semifinished-blank comprising a set of substantially rigid parts detached from each other and having a shape of core sides.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest each feature recited in amended Claim 1.

The Office Action on page 7 asserts that “[t]he argument regarding discrete binder application in Desyatov is noted however the claims are not commensurate in scope with this argument.” Accordingly, Claim 1 is amended such that hardening of the binder occurs after impregnation of the blank. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is found in the original specification, for example at page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 8. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1, and all claims which depend thereon, as anticipated by or unpatentable over Desyatov, be withdrawn.

Lewis discusses a system and method for pultruding a continuous length of resin impregnated fiber reinforcement to form a segmented pultruded shape having alternating cured and uncured sections. However, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 Lewis, a heat supply for

hardening a thermosetting resin (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed binder) in the prepreg is applied **along a full surface of a rigid section 57** (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed blank) with respect to the die 23. Then “the quencher 61 may either cool or remove the resin 19 from flexible section 59.”¹ Thus, Lewis does not disclose or suggest “hardening the binder during hot-pressing, wherein a heat supply for hardening the binder in the prepreg is applied within boundaries of prepreg parts,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1, and all claims which depend thereon, as anticipated by or unpatentable over Lewis, be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6 depend on Claim 1, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the remaining cited references (Desyatov '604 and Strachan) do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Desyatov and Lewis. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 5 and 6 be withdrawn.

¹ See Lewis, at col. 6, lines 46-48.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Bohri', is written over a horizontal line.

Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Adnan H. Bohri
Registration No. 62,648